

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

11	ADAPTIX, INC.,	Case No. 5:13-cv-01774 PSG
12	Plaintiff,	<b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER</b>
13	v.	<b>(Re: Docket No. 109)</b>
14	MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC, <i>et al</i> ,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	ADAPTIX, INC.,	Case No. 5:13-cv-01776 PSG
18	Plaintiff,	<b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER</b>
19	v.	<b>(Re: Docket No. 144)</b>
20	APPLE INC, <i>et al</i> ,	
21	Defendants.	
22		
23	ADAPTIX, INC.,	Case No. 5:13-cv-01777 PSG
24	Plaintiff,	<b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER</b>
25	v.	<b>(Re: Docket No. 143)</b>
26	APPLE INC., <i>et al</i> ,	
27	Defendants.	
28		

1 ADAPTIX, INC., 2 Plaintiff, 3 v. 4 AT&T MOBILITY LLC, <i>et al</i> , 5 Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-01778 PSG <b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER</b> <b>(Re: Docket No. 150)</b>
6 ADAPTIX, INC., 7 Plaintiff, 8 v. 9 CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON 10 WIRELESS, HTC CORPORATION, and HTC 11 AMERICA, INC., 12 Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-01844 PSG <b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER</b> <b>(Re: Docket No. 134)</b>
13 ADAPTIX, INC., 14 Plaintiff, 15 v. 16 APPLE INC., <i>et al</i> , 17 Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-02023 PSG <b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER</b> <b>(Re: Docket No. 125)</b>

18  
 19 In this patent infringement suit, Adaptix, Inc. alleges that Motorola Mobility, L.L.C, Apple,  
 20 Inc., AT&T Mobility L.L.C, and Cellco Partnership *d/b/a* Verizon Wireless infringes U.S. Patent  
 21 No. 6,947,748 and U.S. Patent No. 7,454,212. Yesterday and today, the court held a tutorial and  
 22 claim construction hearing. The court's constructions are as follows:

<u>CLAIM TERM</u>	<u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
24 “Select[ing] a set of candidate subcarriers” 25 ‘748 Patent: <i>Claims 6, 8, 19, 21</i> 26 ‘212 Patent: <i>Claim 1, 18</i>	“Selecting” = “Choosing.” All other terms: plain and ordinary meaning
27 “Subcarriers [of/from] the set of 28 subcarriers selected by the [] base station”	“Subcarriers that the base station has chosen from the set of

1	‘748 Patent: <i>Claims 6, 8, 19, 21</i> ‘212 Patent: <i>Claim 1, 18</i>	candidate subcarriers selected by the subscriber”
2		
3	“SINR Value”  ‘748 Patent: <i>Claim 1, 19</i>	“Calculation based on the Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise Ratios of the cluster’s subcarriers”
4		
5		
6	“Index indication of a candidate cluster with it(s) ((SINR) value)”  ‘748 Patent: <i>Claims 6, 19</i>	“Identifier (ID) of a chosen candidate cluster of subcarriers with its SINR value.”
7		
8		
9		
10	“Arbitrarily order[ed/ing]”  ‘748 Patent: <i>Claims 6, 19</i> ‘212 Patent: <i>Claims 13, 28</i>	“Order[ed/ing] in a manner not previously defined”
11		
12		
13	“A system employing orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA)”  ‘748 Patent: <i>Claims 6, 8</i> ‘212 Patent: <i>Claim 1</i>	“OFDMA”: orthogonal frequency division multiple access  All other terms: plain and ordinary meaning
14		
15		
16		
17	“Subcarrier allocation for OFDMA”  ‘748 Patent: <i>Claim 11</i>	“OFDMA”: orthogonal frequency division multiple access  All other terms: plain and ordinary meaning
18		
19		
20		
21	“OFDMA subcarriers”  ‘748 Patent: <i>Claims 11, 19, 21</i> ‘212 Patent: <i>Claim 18</i>	“OFDMA”: orthogonal frequency division multiple access;  All other terms: plain and ordinary meaning
22		
23		
24	“intra-cell traffic load balancing”  ‘748 Patent: <i>Claim 11</i>	“balancing cluster usage within a cell of a base station”
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 The parties should rest assured that the court arrived at these constructions with a full  
2 appreciation of not only the relevant intrinsic and extrinsic evidence, but also the Federal Circuit's  
3 teachings in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*<sup>1</sup> and its progeny. So that the parties may pursue whatever  
4 recourse they believe is necessary, a complete opinion will issue before entry of any judgment.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: December 19, 2013  
7

8   
PAUL S. GREWAL  
9 United States Magistrate Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

<sup>1</sup> 415 F.3d 1303, 1312-15 (Fed. Cir. 2005).